

Serial No. 09/710,723  
Page 5

### REMARKS

This is in response to the final Office Action mailed December 3, 2002, in relation to the above-identified patent application. In that Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-11, 13-18, and 20-24 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day et. al. in view of Nelson.

On March 7, 2003, Applicant and Applicant's attorney conducted a telephone interview and agreed upon language for allowance of the application. That same day, Applicant faxed to the examiner proposed amended claim language. The Examiner replied on March 10, 2003 with a draft amendment. Immediately thereafter, Applicant's attorney and Examiner Pollard had a telephone conversation and it was agreed that the application would go to issue and that the Examiner would issue an Examiner's amendment. We were waiting on the Examiner's amendment and after several telephone messages to the Examiner, we telephoned the Supervising Attorney and was told that Examiner Pollard had retired. We submit herewith the copy of the faxed Examiner's communication to us of March 10, 2003, including the allowed claim amendments.

Serial No. 09/710,723  
Page 6

### CONCLUSION

Also enclosed is an Extension of Time replying to the outstanding office action. In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending apparatus claims of the present invention have been amended to particularly define the unobvious structure of the present invention. It is respectfully submitted that, as amended, all of the pending claims of the subject patent application are in condition for immediate allowance. An allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

HIGGS, FLETCHER & MACK LLP  
Attorneys for Applicant

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Charles F. Reidelbach, Jr., Esq.  
Registration No. 36,649

401 West A Street  
Suite 2600  
San Diego, CA 92101  
Telephone: 619-236-1551  
Facsimile: 619-696-1410  
E-Mail: reidelbach@higgslaw.com